

Young Refuses to  
Testify Before a  
Grand Jury Hearing  
on West Coast  
Break-In

**KROGH IS ORDERED  
TO APPEAR JULY 5**

JUN 15 1973

Evidence of 2 Former Aides  
Described as Important  
in Ehrlichman Indictment  
NYTimes

By STEVEN V. ROBERTS

Special to The New York Times

LOS ANGELES, June 14—David Young, a former member of the White House "plumbers" unit assigned to stop security leaks, refused to testify today before a Los Angeles County grand jury investigating the break-in at the office of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Mr. Young, who also served on the staff of President Nixon's foreign affairs adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, appeared for only about eight minutes, and his lawyer, Irwin F. Woodland, told newsmen he would make no public comment. But sources close to the case said that it was a "safe assumption" that Mr. Young had invoked the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

Meanwhile, Egil Krogh Jr., the former chief of the plumbers' group, was ordered by a Superior Court Judge in Washington to appear before the grand jury here on July 5.

Mr. Krogh had fought a subpoena on the ground that he was a prime target of the grand jury investigation and should not be compelled to testify.

**Promise to the Judge**

Assistant District Attorney Stephen Trott confirmed that Mr. Krogh was a possible defendant in the case but promised Judge Eugene N. Hamilton that Mr. Krogh would not be indicted during any trip to California to testify. The judge then ordered the appearance of Mr. Krogh, who has admitted authorizing the break-in at the office of Dr. Lewis Fielding on Sept. 3, 1971.

The reluctance of Mr. Young and Mr. Krogh to testify here poses a difficult problem for District Attorney Joseph P. Busch, who has focused his investigation on the possibility that a conspiracy existed to commit the break-in.

According to reliable sources, investigators are not sure that they would have enough evidence to indict John D. Ehrlichman, President Nixon's former chief domestic adviser, without the testimony of the two younger aides.

But the investigators are reluctant to grant immunity to Mr. Young and Mr. Krogh—a move that would compel them to testify—because they have already granted immunity to the five men who have admitted actually performing the intrusion.

Mr. Ehrlichman, who supervised the plumbers and gave them general approval for "covert" activity, has repeatedly denied that he knew about the burglary before it happened. Informed sources say he maintained that when he testified before the grand jury here last week.

**Knowledge of Break-In**

But according to press reports from Washington, Mr. Young has told the Federal grand jury there that Mr. Ehrlichman did know about the break-in plans. After being granted immunity, Mr. Young reportedly produced a memorandum that outlined the plan and said that Mr. Ehrlichman had approved it.

Testifying yesterday before a House Armed Services subcommittee, Mr. Ehrlichman softened his earlier denial and said that he had approved "some sort of proposal" by the plumbers but "did not recollect" its exact contents, according to Representative Lucien N. Nedzi of Michigan, the subcommittee chairman.

Under the law, Mr. Young's Washington testimony cannot be used against him here. But the District Attorney is studying ways in which the memorandum describing the break-in plans could be presented to the grand jury. One major problem is how the prosecutors would authenticate the document without the testimony of Mr. Young or Mr. Krogh.

Mr. Young's Washington testimony appears to conflict with that given by Mr. Ehrlichman here, and Mr. Busch said today that he "wouldn't eliminate the possibility" of pursuing perjury charges along with any other indictments that might flow from the investigation.